



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

It is safe to say, that no European government would think either of establishing a colony or of attempting to occupy territory on the American Continent without considering in that connection the attitude of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Ladies and Gentlemen: I am sure you are deeply obliged to Mr. Tower for his very interesting and valuable statement of the European attitude toward the Monroe Doctrine. We have had this declaration of principle examined in the light of its origin and history. We have had the Latin American view in favor of it and against it expressed.

It was our hope to have a comparison of the Monroe Doctrine of 1823 with the doctrine of the present day, and an answer to the question, Should it continue to be a policy of the United States? by Mr. Charles B. Elliott, formerly Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of Minnesota and of the Philippine Islands, and formerly a member of the Philippine Commission. No doubt Mr. Elliott would have examined the Monroe Doctrine in its relation to the Pacific. Unfortunately, we have just received a telegram from Mr. Elliott, stating his inability to be present on account of illness, with the further statement that he refrained from telegraphing until the last moment because of his very great desire to be present. But although we will not be able to cover that aspect of the question tonight, nevertheless the question involved in the title, Should the Monroe Doctrine continue to be a policy of the United States? will be discussed by a very competent speaker, Mr. George H. Blakeslee, Professor of History at Clark University, whom I now have the pleasure of presenting to you.

## SHOULD THE MONROE DOCTRINE CONTINUE TO BE A POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES?

ADDRESS OF GEORGE H. BLAKESLEE,  
*Professor of History, Clark University*

During the past year there has been an epidemic of discussion regarding the Monroe Doctrine. This has been due probably to the dawning consciousness in the minds of the people of this country that there exist strong, stable nations in South America, which no

longer need the protection of this traditional foreign policy, and which keenly resent its supposed spirit of guardianship. The problem whether it should be continued unchanged, or be modified or abandoned, has been a live issue in our newspapers and periodicals; it has been debated in schools, colleges and universities in all parts of the United States; it has frequently, at least in New England, been the topic at economic clubs; and, finally, it has been studied from nearly every aspect at three recent conferences of those especially interested in our foreign relations.

Yet there exists a certain feeling that this questioning of the infallibility of the Monroe Doctrine is merely a temporary fad, that it represents nothing substantial, and that it will soon be past, leaving the traditional American policy unchanged and unshaken. This view was expressed only the other day by the Honorable Champ Clark, who said, "Every now and then somebody rises up and solemnly informs us that the Monroe Doctrine is dead. I answer such people as those in the words of Grover Cleveland \* \* \* Cleveland said, 'We are sovereign on this continent.'" Mr. Clark added in a tone of absolute finality, "And we are." This idea that the Monroe Doctrine has still an unshakable hold on the American people is shown further by the recent words of a British essayist. "To the Americans," he says, "the Monroe Doctrine is like God or religion to a small child—something fearful, something to inspire awe, something, if necessary, to fight for." Is the keen British essayist correct? Is the Monroe Doctrine, after all, like God to the American people? Are we still content to accept as a matter of faith, without a question or a doubt, the inspiring and all-sufficient creed, "We are sovereign on this continent?"

In order to answer such queries as these it seemed very desirable to secure some definite evidence regarding the general attitude of thoughtful men in this country towards the Monroe Doctrine. But how might this attitude be discovered? Whose opinions should be asked? It was finally decided to obtain, first of all, if possible, the judgment of the lecturers on international law and American diplomacy in our colleges and universities, since these form almost the only body of men, all of whom as a class have given this subject professional study and whose opinions at the same time are almost entirely uninfluenced by political or party considerations. The writer there-

fore took the liberty of sending to each of these a set of questions. None were sent to any out of this class in order that no possible suspicion of personal bias in making the selection might affect the result of the canvass.

The questionnaire read:

I. Should the Monroe Doctrine, as now generally understood and interpreted in the United States and in Latin America, be continued without either modification or further definition?

II. Does it need clearer interpretation?

(a) For the people of the United States?

(b) For the people of Latin America?

III. Should the stable Latin American States (at present Argentina, Brazil and Chile) be regarded by the United States as supporters of the Monroe Doctrine?

(a) Should this support be limited to the defense of their own lands from European conquest; or

(b) Should they be invited to coöperate with the United States in interpreting and enforcing the Monroe Doctrine wherever it may apply on this hemisphere?

IV. Should it be abandoned?

(a) Entirely?

(b) Below the Equator? or

(c) Only so far as concerns the stable Latin American States (Argentina, Brazil and Chile)?

V. Other views, comments and reasons, if any.

One hundred and forty-six replied, representing nearly all of our leading colleges and universities, and including seemingly the larger number of those best known as leaders in this field.

A study of these returns shows that certain general conclusions are agreed upon by a very large majority. These are: First, the present status of the Monroe Doctrine is unsatisfactory; of the total number who voted, only thirteen believe that it should be continued substantially as it now exists, that is, with its meaning somewhat indefinite and its interpretation and enforcement dependent upon this country alone. Second, it should nevertheless not be abandoned; only nine wish to give up the policy entirely. Third, it should be more clearly explained and decidedly modified in certain respects. The form of modification favored by a notably large majority is one which will

recognize in some way the importance of at least such sister American republics as Argentina, Brazil, Chile and possibly Peru. It is held, five to one (104 to 20), that the United States should share with these stable republics the responsibility of enforcing the doctrine by adopting one of the three following policies, (1) complete coöperation with them, or (2) abandonment of the policy south of the Equator, or (3) abandonment so far as the stable states themselves are concerned. It is complete coöperation with them, however, which is generally favored; the large majority, eighty-five against thirty, believe that the stable Latin American states should be invited to coöperate with the United States in both interpreting and enforcing the Monroe Doctrine wherever it may apply on this hemisphere. This strong sentiment in favor of coöperation in its widest possible extent is the more surprising and the more significant in view of the fact that the doctrine has always been regarded as a policy to be interpreted and enforced by the United States alone.

These then are the views of a body of Americans who have made this subject a special study: the Monroe Doctrine should not be abandoned, but it should be more clearly explained, and it should be modified so as to rest upon a basis formed by the coöperation of all stable American republics.

In addition to this general summary, it will be valuable to consider the several propositions more in detail. First in importance is the question whether the Monroe Doctrine should be continued or abandoned. Typical comments from those who would renounce it entirely are as follows: "Not needed by United States; not desired by Latin America;" "The basis of the doctrine is gone, for we are in a world age and not a hemisphere age;" and "It is costly and dangerous; likely to embroil us in war; makes South America suspicious of our territorial cupidity and unfriendly. \* \* \* It implies an insult to a spirited people who do not ask for it or acknowledge it." Others would abandon the name, but retain the principle. "The words 'Monroe Doctrine' and 'Monroeism,'" one writes, "have come to have such a disagreeable connotation among our neighbors that our policy towards Latin America ought to receive some other name."

Those who believe that the doctrine should be continued rest their contention, for the most part, so far as they have expressed their reasons, upon the belief that there is still danger of European or

Asiatic acquisition of territory in this hemisphere. Some of the comments are: "No; it should not be abandoned, for the weaker states of South America would be seized and colonized by foreign Powers before half a decade;" "We should maintain the doctrine as it is, or strengthened, for another one hundred years, or until the danger of European invasion is past;" and "The greater danger after all lies rather in the possibility of a sale to some great Power by some South or Central American state. Therein lies the strongest argument for maintaining the general position of the doctrine." A particularly forceful statement of this view comes from a former diplomat, who says:

As one formerly engaged in the application of the Monroe Doctrine \* \* \* I am tremendously concerned over the present tendency to discredit the doctrine as entirely useless. We are practically inviting trouble with Europe by such an attitude. We do not want another African scramble. \* \* \* There are European nations which are allowing big indebtedness on the part of certain rich states of Spanish America to grow up, in order to have a greater reason for intervention when the opportune moment should arise. It would seem criminal for us to scuttle out at this time.

On this question, whether or not the Monroe Doctrine should be given up entirely, nine favor abandonment; 123 oppose it.

But if it is not to be abandoned, it should, it is believed, be more definitely explained. That a clearer interpretation is needed for the people of Latin America, is asserted by 107, only twenty dissenting; while an only slightly smaller majority (94 against 32) maintain that it is needed also for the people of the United States. "No one knows what it means," writes one. "The history of its applications," replies another, "would seem to indicate that it means what the existing administration would like to have it mean." Still another says, "it means anything and everything. It is a cry to stampede the people when there need be no real alarm. We are even trying to believe with Champ Clark that to repeal the Panama Canal toll bill is to abandon the Monroe Doctrine." For Latin America it is held that the doctrine should be interpreted in such a way as to exclude from it all idea of territorial covetousness and, if possible, all claim of political sovereignty and tutelage. This view is shown by the following comments:

"It should be made clear that the Monroe Doctrine is no part of any policy of political aggrandizement by the United States;" "It should be further defined so as to make it apparent that the United States has no desire to interfere in Spanish-American affairs;" and "The Latin Americans consider it an unnecessary and at present indefinable assumption of superiority and of guardianship on the part of the United States."

One suggestion as to the modification of the Monroe Doctrine, urged by many, is that we should return to the simple, strictly defensive policy of President Monroe. The following replies explain this position: "Very important to rid the doctrine of some of the modern interpretations;" "There is grave danger of our being dragged into a policy of imperialism if we retain it as it is;" "We ought to return to the original construction. \* \* \* To assume the position taken by recent Presidents of a kind of guardianship over all South America, including Mexico and Central America, seems to be a piece of arrogance, and is productive of infinite future trouble;" and, "The original Monroe Doctrine was clearly justified. \* \* \* The Polk-Frelinghuysen-Olney-Cleveland-Roosevelt-Lodge version of it is a constant source of irritation to the South American republics and is a menace to the peace of the world. \* \* \* It is antiquated, worn out, and in its present form ought to be abandoned." How widely this view is held it is impossible to say, since no definite question was asked regarding it which would bring out a general expression of opinion.

Another suggestion as to the modification of the doctrine is that the United States should abandon it either south of the region marked in general by the Equator or the Orinoco, or else so far as the stable South American republics are concerned. Of those who hold this view some favor absolute and unqualified abandonment, as is shown in the following statement: "What transpires in Argentina is of no more concern to us than what happens in Africa." Others oppose absolute abandonment, but would give over the enforcement of the policy in lower South America to the stable republics and would remove from it, so far as this region is concerned, all idea of sovereignty, protection and guardianship. This is shown in the following replies: "Yes, it should be abandoned in so far as it implies a protectorate over them;" "Not abandoned, but suspended as long as the

policy and conduct of these states show them to be supporters of the doctrine;" and "The Monroe Doctrine should be abandoned with reference to Brazil, Argentina, and Chile, save to protect them from European conquest." The summary of opinions shows that nine would abandon the doctrine south of the Equator, while twenty-seven would abandon it in Argentina, Brazil and Chile; thus making thirty-six who favor giving up the policy for part of South America.

Whether or not the doctrine is thus abandoned locally, a very strong sentiment is shown that in any case a sharp distinction should be made by our government, in its application of the Monroe Doctrine, between the Panama Canal region, on the one hand (Mexico, Central America, the West Indies, Venezuela and Colombia), and, on the other, the region of the stable republics of South America. This view is shown by such quotations as these: "Over the Caribbean states, Mexico to Venezuela, our position should be that of a protecting Power, with treaty rights wherever possible, to support stable governments;" "The doctrine should be extended and made more positive for the Caribbean countries;" and "As to territory between the Rio Grande and the Panama Canal the United States must act alone and be practically paramount." Somewhat more than forty of those who answered the questionnaire went out of their way to express their opinion in one form or another that there should be a marked difference, in the application of our policies, between these two sections.

The modification of the Monroe Doctrine which appeals most strongly to the body of men whose opinions we are discussing, is, as has been said, some form of coöperation. There are those who oppose coöperation, however, on the ground that, "We are sovereign on this hemisphere," and should play the part. Others oppose it from the fear that it would lead to a hard and fast alliance in which the United States might be out-voted on questions of vital concern, especially in the Panama region. As one of these critics writes, "If such a policy were adopted the Latin Powers would dominate the affairs of the new world."

Representative opinions of those favoring coöperation are as follows: "The Monroe Doctrine should take in all America and all America both North and South, should unite in upholding it;" "The Monroe Doctrine should be turned into a mutual association of equal



states, supporting one another for the common welfare of the Americas and operating for the development and prosperity of each and all;" "Unless we can obtain their support the doctrine is futile;" "We should not excite the sensibilities of the Latin American states by claims of superiority and of sovereignty on this hemisphere, but join with the well behaved states in guiding the weak ones;" and "The trend, seems to me, is toward a world's concert of the great nations, but as long as there is the Concert of Europe, let us have an American concert of nations, the United States and the three more stable of the South American republics, and other American nations as fast as they prove their fitness."

If the writer might hazard a further explanation of the kind of coöperation which is generally desired, he would suggest that it is in the nature of an understanding rather than of any definite alliance. While coöperation should take place in the sense of a mutual exchanging of views; joint agreements, so far as possible, upon questions of interpretation and defense; and occasionally joint military operations; yet, in the ordinary course, such stable states as Argentina, Brazil, Chile and possibly Peru would naturally take the lead in enforcing the Monroe Doctrine in their own section, and the United States would expect a like leadership in the region about the Caribbean Sea.

In one of the letters received in answer to the list of questions sent out, a university professor wrote: "Your summary will be most interesting. \* \* \* Will it, however, represent the American people? There seems," he said, "a considerable disposition among those of us who fill academic positions to discard or deprecate the doctrine." To anticipate such an implied criticism as this, it should be stated that no claim is made that this summary of the views of the lecturers upon International Law represents the ordinary thought of "the man on the street." It is believed, however, that it is an excellent test of the attitude of the best informed and of the most advanced public opinion of the nation, as well as of the judgment towards which this country as a whole is rapidly tending.

But the writer wished also to gauge the feelings of "the American people," as the letter has expressed it, and so sent this same set of questions to a carefully selected list of newspapers and periodicals. From the replies received, and from a few recent editorials in which

one or more phases of the doctrine are discussed, answers or opinions upon some or all of the questions submitted have been obtained from forty-seven leading publications.

The first impression is that the foremost newspapers and periodicals, instead of being enthusiastic supporters of the present Monroe Doctrine, as it was expected they would be, are somewhat hazy in their views regarding the various aspects of the policy. The editor of the *Omaha Bee* writes, "I doubt whether the sentiment of our general public is crystalized on the subject of the Monroe Doctrine," and he adds, "Speaking briefly of my own views, and which I think reflect the views of many with whom I come in contact, I would say that the Monroe Doctrine needs redefinition."

But the important fact regarding the opinions of the press, so far as they have been obtained, is that they accord substantially with those of the college and university professors of international law and diplomacy. There is a general feeling of dissatisfaction with the doctrine in its present form, a belief that it should be more clearly explained, and that it should be modified in certain respects. Only four publications definitely give full approval to the doctrine as it is generally interpreted at the present time. One of these is the *Kansas City Star*, which states, "The *Kansas City Star* always upholds the President on matters of foreign policy, including his interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine." Two of the others are the *Springfield Republican* and the *Brooklyn Eagle*.

On the other hand, there is a general conviction that the doctrine should not be given up entirely. The *Louisville Courier Journal* seems to be the only paper to favor complete abandonment.

As to constructive changes, a large majority, thirty to seven, believe that the doctrine needs clearer interpretation, especially for Latin America. The modification of the doctrine which the press believe is needed, is the same suggested by such a large majority of the university world, coöperation with at least the stable American republics. So far as definite views have been expressed on this point, thirty favor coöperation of some form, while only six show that they are definitely opposed to it. Twenty-five believe in the most complete coöperation, that is, in joint action by the stable Latin American countries and the United States in both interpreting and enforcing the Monroe Doctrine wherever it may apply on this hemisphere.

A few direct quotations from various papers will show the general dissatisfaction with this policy in its present form: "The Monroe Doctrine is as elastic as India rubber and as comprehensive as all outdoors" (*New York Sun*); "That vague thing known as the Monroe Doctrine" (*New York Evening Post*); "The whole world would be grateful for some dependable definition" (*Detroit Free Press*); "The doctrine should be abandoned or emphatically restated" (*Harrisburg Telegraph*); "The time has clearly come for revaluing the Monroe Doctrine" (*Boston Herald*); "The Monroe Doctrine, President-made in the first place, has been made over and over again until its own father wouldn't know his child" (*The New York Press*); "It means just what we wish it to mean, and is to be applied only when we think it wise. It has been modified to death" (*The Nation*).

Some papers strongly favor a return to the original meaning of Monroe, as is shown by the following comments: "It should be continued as stated by Monroe" (*Omaha World-Herald*); "In principle it should be continued. The interpretation of the doctrine in late years is an unwarranted extension of the responsibility of the United States" (*Wilkes-Barre Record*); "The Monroe Doctrine should be construed strictly by the terms of its early formulation. The United States by adherence to it assumes no office of policing South and Central American countries" (*The State*, Columbia, S. C.); "As it is now interpreted here and elsewhere, the Monroe Doctrine becomes not only a menace to our peace and safety but fails utterly in its benevolent purpose as regards the southern republics" (*New York World*); the Monroe Doctrine "does not make us the guardian and wet-nurse of Latin American republics. \* \* \* There is great need that the Latin American nations, European nations, and especially *this* nation should understand thoroughly what the doctrine does mean and does not mean" (*The Duluth Herald*).

There is, further, a widely held conviction that the Monroe Doctrine should be changed from a unilateral to a Pan American basis. Several of the publications gave their reasons for this belief and their comments, some of which are as follows: "It should mean that all stable republics should unite to prevent aggression or colonies representing European or Asiatic Powers" (*The Philadelphia Public Ledger*); "It is only through the frankest coöperation \* \* \* that the Monroe Doctrine can be prevented from becoming a source of offense between

the United States and the other nations of the new world" (*Detroit Free Press*); "The remedy \* \* \* is a complete abandonment of our pretensions to any special influence in the policies, government and destinies of any American nation except our own, and inviting all well established American governments to join with us in the formulation and enforcement of a Pan American policy" (*San Francisco Chronicle*); "We believe that thorough coöperation with South American republics, stable or unstable, will convince them of the wisdom of the Monroe Doctrine. There is doubt if it should be enforced unless it has their thorough coöperation" (*Tacoma Daily News*); "The doctrine which Roosevelt is preaching in South America to the effect that the stable governments be invited to coöperate with the United States in enforcing the Monroe Doctrine wherever it may appear to be necessary hereafter, meets with my personal views on the matter" (Editor of *The Los Angeles Express*). Of the periodicals, *The Outlook* says: "We emphatically believe that whenever the United States has occasion to interpret and enforce the Monroe Doctrine, the United States should take for granted that it has the approval of Argentina, Brazil and Chile, and in any instance which involves or may involve intervention, the United States ought to invite their coöperation." The *Independent* expresses a similar but slightly different view which is held by several, that there should be complete coöperation in South American matters but unilateral enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine by the United States in the Caribbean region, and adds, "In our concern for the well-being of the peoples of the Western Hemisphere, \* \* \* we must be their partner, not their patron."

The majority of the press, then, agree with the majority of the experts, that the present status of the Monroe Doctrine is unsatisfactory, that the policy should be clarified by a clearer interpretation of its meaning and that it should be broadened and strengthened by being placed upon a Pan American foundation.

The Monroe Doctrine has been called a President-made policy, and there is some justification for the expression. The present day opinion, then, of those who have once helped to interpret and to enforce this policy, must have particular value. Ex-President Taft, in a recent address, states that Europe is so little likely to seize territory from Argentina, Brazil and Chile that the doctrine may well be re-

garded as no longer in force so far as they are concerned. To give his exact words, "this possibility is so remote that it practically removes them from the operation of the Monroe Doctrine. I am glad," he continues, "that Mr. Roosevelt in his visit to those countries has sought to impress them with the same view of the Monroe Doctrine that I have thus expressed." In regard to establishing complete coöperation, he says, "If we could do this, I would be glad to have it done, because it would relieve us of part of a burden and would give greater weight to the declaration of the policy. I would be glad to have an effort tactfully made to this end." After expressing his apprehension that this may not be possible, he adds, "I hope my fear in this respect will prove to be unfounded and that the plan suggested may be successful."

Ex-President Roosevelt holds somewhat similar views. In his address to the people of Argentina he exclaimed: "I wish there to be no doubt of my meaning. As far as you are concerned, we have no more concern with the Monroe Doctrine about you than you have about us \* \* \* The Monroe Doctrine in the sense of special guardianship thereof by the United States of the North no longer applies." In regard to coöperation he expresses the hope that "all of the Latin American peoples will finally reach such a level of orderly self-government, of material prosperity, of potential strength, and of political and social conduct as to make the Monroe Doctrine, in the sense of being a merely unilateral doctrine, a thing of the past and to substitute for it a common agreement among all the free republics of the New World."

To this list of those now living who have notably helped to create the Monroe Doctrine of today, should be added the name of Honorable Richard Olney, Secretary of State during the Venezuela dispute in the administration of President Cleveland. The words of this distinguished statesman that "the United States is practically sovereign on this continent," are quoted continually, but they fail to do full justice to Mr. Olney's position. Before the American Society of International Law, in 1907, he stated his belief in the principle of coöperation in the enforcement of the present Monroe Doctrine. He still holds these views, for, not many weeks ago, he mailed a copy of this address with the following quotation double marked: "How and on what lines is it desirable that the United States should proceed?"

Surely not by making itself a sort of international American 'boss'—but by proceeding on lines justified by precedent and the highest considerations of policy—by initiating, cultivating and working through an American concert.”

The only living ex-Presidents, then, Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Taft, both believe that the Monroe Doctrine, at least in its sense of guardianship and tutelage, should be considered inoperative for such states as Argentina, Brazil and Chile. The three men, now living, who have probably had the largest part in enforcing the doctrine, all believe that it should be modified, if possible, by being placed upon some sort of an all-American agreement.

Should the Monroe Doctrine, then, continue to be a policy of the United States, to quote the question assigned for this closing hour? In the judgment of a large majority of 146 lecturers upon international law and American diplomacy in our colleges and universities, of a majority of forty-seven leading American newspapers and periodicals, and of our two living ex-Presidents, the Monroe Doctrine should continue to be a policy of the United States; but it should not continue as it is now popularly understood, an indefinite policy, to be interpreted and enforced by the United States alone, and considered operative in full force throughout the entire hemisphere. It should be more clearly interpreted; and should be placed, in some way, upon a broader all-American basis.

But further questions arise. Which of the many definitions presented at this annual meeting shall be accepted, and how shall this definition be made authoritative? Just what shall be the function of this American “concert”? What shall be its rights and its duties? What shall be the limits to its action? How shall matters of all-American concern be differentiated from matters of more national concern? Finally, just how are our sister republics to be “tactfully invited” to join us in a policy of coöperation? These are important questions, but their answers must be left to some other occasion. The purpose of this paper has been fulfilled—to show the general attitude towards the Monroe Doctrine of representatives of the thoughtful classes of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. We are all deeply indebted to Professor Blakeslee for voicing the opinion of many whom we would like to see at our

meetings, but whom we can never hope to see attend. This completes what may be called the written program for this evening. The subject is open for discussion. Is there any desire that either or both the papers be discussed?

I take it I am correct in assuming that there is no desire that this meeting be prolonged. Therefore, with the announcement that the Society will meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning to transact administrative business, I declare this meeting adjourned until that time.